

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action mailed August 25, 2005. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-49 were pending in the Application. Applicants amend Claims 1, 5-6, 9-14, 19, 25, 27-28, 30, 32, 35-36, 39, 44-45, and 48 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims and favorable action in this case.

Information Disclosure Statement (IDS)

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the IDS. The Examiner did not consider the reference by Jansen et al. entitled "Applying Mobile Agents to Intrusion Detection and Response," but drew a line through the citation. *Office Action*, p. 2. Applicants respectfully submit that the citation to the above-mentioned reference and the citation to "Mobile Agents in Intrusion Detection and Response" by Jansen et al. are not duplicate citations. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to consider the above-mentioned reference and note such consideration on the IDS.

Sections 102 Rejection

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-49 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being anticipated by Jansen et al. (article entitled "Applying Mobile Agents to Intrusion Detection and Response" hereinafter "*Jansen*"). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection of the above-mentioned claims. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); M.P.E.P. §2131.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Jansen* does not disclose, teach, or suggest either expressly or inherently, each and every element of Claim 1. For example, *Jansen* does not disclose, teach, or suggest "performing actions by an action handler in response to action requests generated by the other system handlers and received from the master control processor, wherein the master control processor routes messages to and from the system handlers without being involved in security and resource management functions distributed among the system handlers." Because *Jansen* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least this

limitation, Applicants respectfully submit that *Jansen* cannot anticipate Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claim 1 along with its dependents.

Independent Claims 30 and 48 each recite certain limitations that, for reasons substantially similar to those discussed with reference to independent Claim 1, *Jansen* does not disclose, teach, or suggest. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 30 and 48 together with their dependents.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
062891.0918

PATENT APPLICATION
09/683,507

15

CONCLUSION

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for all other reasons clear and apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

Applicants believe no fee is due. However, if this is not correct, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to advance prosecution of this application, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact their attorney, Charles S. Fish, at (214) 953-6507.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Charles S. Fish
Reg. No. 35,870

Date: 23 NOV, 2005

Customer No. **05073**